



Mary-Ann Warmerdam
Director

Department of Pesticide Regulation



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

AGRICULTURAL PEST CONTROL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRAFT AGENDA
November 16, 2010
9:30-12:30
CalEPA Building
First Floor Training Room

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: (10) Ronald Berg- Pest Control Dealers, Linda LaVanne- Agricultural Pest Control Advisers, Kenneth Oneto- FAC section 56115 Mary Louise Flint-UCIPM, and Glen Foth – alternate for Commercial applicators, Phil Mullins– alternate for Pest Control Businesses, Scott Hudson- County Agricultural Commissioner Association, Jim Farrar-California State University System, FAC section 5611, Timothy Smith - Board of Governors of the California Community College System, and Matt Scally– Maintenance Gardener Pest Control Business

Department Staff: (6) David Duncan- Chair of Committee (Ch), Margie Read, Laurie Brajkovich, John Sanders, Sarah Pingitore, and Rayven Jenkins

Guests: (6) Terry Gage- California Agricultural Aircraft Association (CAAA), Joyce Basan- The California Association of Pest Control Advisers (CAPCA), Terry Stark-The California Association of Pest Control Advisers (CAPCA), Judy Letterman – (PAPA), Dave Lawson-Lawson & Associates, John Erisey-Agricultural Pest Control Advisers, and Michael Black - Lawnman

Members Absent: (5) Francisca Johnson General Public Member, Tim Stone - Commercial Applicator Certificate Holders, Dick Stoltz - Pest Control Aircraft Pilots, Ken Nichols - Pest Control Businesses, and Wayne J. Steele - Registrants

Member Vacancies: (1) None

I. Introduction and Administrative Topics - David Duncan- Committee Chair

A. Minutes from August Meeting:

David Duncan informed the committee that the August 18, 2010 meeting minutes will be posted to the DPR website after the meeting is held. All committee members received a copy of the August minutes.



II. Air Monitoring Network - John Sanders, DPR Environmental Monitoring Branch Chief

The Department of Pesticide Regulations is interested in improving its estimates of long term exposures to the public from pesticides in ambient air. One approach is to establish a network of sampling sites in areas of the state where pesticide use is high.

In January 2011 DPR will be initiating a planned monitoring network to sample ambient air for multiple pesticides in Ripon (San Joaquin County), Salinas (Monterey County), and Shafter (Kern County) on a regular once a week schedule, for three years. The samples will be analyzed for 39 pesticides or breakdown products. Samples will be randomly taken over a five day schedule each week for several years.

Throughout 2009, as it developed the project protocol, DPR solicited public comment on project objectives, pesticides to monitor, sampling plan, and communities to monitor. A public workshop was also held in January 2010 to broaden opportunities for public participation.

Project objectives:

- Identify common pesticides in air and determined seasonal, annual, and multiple year concentrations
- Compare air concentrations to sub-chronic and chronic human health screening levels
- Track trends in air concentrations over time
- Estimate cumulative exposure to multiple pesticides with common modes of action
- Correlate air concentrations with pesticide use and local weather patterns

For the project, 226 communities, including 48 communities from North Central Coast air basin, 161 from the San Joaquin Valley, and 17 from Ventura county, were evaluated based upon the pesticide use and demographic characteristics of the communities.

The pesticides to be monitored were selected based on the following criteria:

- Pounds of use by area/region
- Volatility
- DPR risk assessment priority
- Feasibility of including in multi-residue analytical method

The funding for the air monitoring network comes from the existing Air Program budget for chemistry analysis and personnel to collect samples and write reports.

III. Licensing Updates – Margie Read, DPR Licensing & Certification Program Manager

A. Renewal progress

This renewal season has been progressing smoothly. 23% of the individual licenses and 25% of the business licenses have been renewed.

B. On-line renewal system

Licensing is continuing to work with the Information Technology branch for the development of the on-line renewals for individual applicators and businesses. Although the on-line renewal system will not be implemented for the 2010 renewal season, the final process should be approved and completed by the summer of 2011.

C. Finalized regulation

The proposed regulatory action to amend licensing regulations to include subcategory Q (maintenance gardeners), and to specify continuing education (CE) requirements for subcategory Q, P, N and O was adopted in September. From now on, individuals that hold these categories – and only these categories – will only be required to take 8 hours of CE every two years. Individuals that are renewing this year that fit this description will only be held to 8 hours.

D. Exams

Because of the difficulties caused by the delay in the State budget this year, it was necessary for DPR to cancel the September 2010 exams. The cancellation caused difficulties for exam takers who had to be notified that they would not be able to take the exam on the dates that they requested. In order to avoid this, it has been decided that the exam schedule for 2011 will not include locations away from Sacramento after June 30. There will, however, be more Sacramento exam dates to compensate for the inconvenience. Additionally, DPR will schedule exams in October at locations such as Los Angeles and San Bernardino, but these will not be posted until there is confidence that the budget will be signed in time.

IV. UC IPM update - Mary Louise Flint, UC Davis IPM

Mary Louise stated that there was not much to report since the last committee meeting.

She also said that UC IPM would like to see the ‘Train the Trainer’ programs up and running again, and David felt this to be good news and stated that he will bring it up at the winter conference. He requested a card listing the IPM programs.

A year-round IPM program is an annual plan of action that can be used to implement integrated pest management and evaluate its success. For each crop growth stage or time of year, these programs highlight the most important pests – invertebrate, weed, disease, nematode, vertebrate, and pest management activities. Funds are being made available to growers to participate in this program. UC IPM will start the safety information/education program by the summer of 2011.

- Develop a check list for IPM process for crops
 - Pull together by season by listing crops with year-round IPM programs
 - What are things needed done? ex: dormant season
 - Develop a check list for IPM process for crops

V. Performance Indicator subcommittee status - Mary Louise Flint, UC Davis IPM

MaryAnn’s Warmerdam signed and returned the on-line APCAC recommendation that was sent by the subcommittee for concurrence and approval.

The subcommittee has already developed recommendations for approval of online courses, but was concerned that the recommendation included “correspondence” courses. The committee did not make that recommendation and feel that correspondence courses amounted to filling out an answer sheet and mailing it in, whereas an on-line course could/would have rolling exams and present better course quality of the information.

Informative handouts were provided that listed evaluations that pertained to use of subject matter as a general topic area as suggested as per the October 7, 2010 Performance Indicator workshop.

The subcommittee discussed ideas regarding acceptable subject matter. The consensus is that there needs to be consistency with the “live” and “on-line” courses, and that all of the CE hours are approved equally.

Other questions posed included:

- Is the class content cross/referenced to the instructor qualification to teach the class?
- How will it be determined and resolved why some courses are very informative and some are not
- What happens when the accredited course topic is not covered in the class

It was also noted that half of the states have some form of CE classes. Some states take advantage of winter weather (snow) and offer more classes at this time. Minnesota uses the co-operative extension to present classes.

Wisconsin does not offer CE at all, and the applicators must retest every 5 years to renew their licenses, and out-reach programs are not offered.

VI. Certification and Training Assessment Group (CTAG) update - David Duncan, DPR National Certification and Training Advisory Group (CTAG)

The National Certification and Training Advisory Group (CTAG) is a collaborative organization focused on maintaining and improving the quality of pesticide training and certification programs in the United States. Members include representatives from state pesticide regulatory agencies, pesticide educators from land grant universities, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) personnel, and representatives from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

There are 16 board members from USEPA Headquarters and Regional Offices, State Lead Agency (SLA), Cooperative Extension Service (CES), and tribes through the Tribal Pesticide Program Council. The board membership changes every three years.

In recent years, public needs and demands exceeded the capabilities of the original pesticide applicator certification and training programs originally established.

CTAG will seek input from stakeholders to determine necessary documents, tools, and guidance while developing guidelines for recertification programs that include verification of attendance, online training efforts with an emphasis on security and delivery, and training content.

When an issue is evaluated by CTAG, it is typically the result of widespread concern among partners and stakeholders who are interested in solutions with broad applicability.

The Certification Plan and Reporting Database (CPARD) was developed as a collaborative effort between National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), is a standardized electronic database developed by CTAG to maintain and submit state certification plans and annual certification data to USEPA.

CPARD began for several reasons. It simplifies and standardizes the updating and review processes for federal agencies, states, territories, tribes and EPA regional offices. Information in the various C&T plans is now more easily accessible and shared among SLA's.

Content relevant tests (certification exams) and training manuals are central to certification and training (C&T) programs nationwide, and show that a candidate has the required knowledge and skills to perform the job of a pesticide applicator. The USEPA has always expected states to follow a standard process when developing annual cooperative agreements. The importance of this responsibility has again surfaced as one of the proposed federal C&T regulation changes that would require states to implement a development process that measures competency for the most important aspects of an occupation. Thus, CTAG created a Guidance Document to help states deal with this potential reality. Ideas will be going out to states for consensus.

Some examples include:

- Recommend all states to give proctored, written, closed book exams for both private and commercial applicators of restricted use pesticides
- Establish a standard core competency exam
- Evaluate content criteria of recertification programs
- Establish a Minimum age Requirement for Certification to Use Restricted use Pesticides
- Verifying attendance at Training events
- Guidance for the states with internal reviews
- On-line training - Course design and structure
- Reciprocity

It is the hope of the board to see updates and changes made to the program. USEPA will go through the program plan and offer regulation changes which will hopefully be noticed and open for comment in the spring.

VII. Draft CE Regulations for CE Sponsors - David Duncan, DPR

David provided a copy of the Draft Regulatory Language regarding Records of Continuing Education. The proposed amendment for section 6513 of the California Code of Regulations which will read as follows:

- (a) The instructor or sponsoring organization shall maintain a record of licensee and certificate holders who have ~~successfully~~ completed continuing education course(s) for three years from the completion date of the course program.
- (b) Each Licensee and certificate holder specified in section 6511 shall maintain a record for three years of all continuing education approved pursuant to section 6512 which he/she acquired during each license or certificate period.
- (c) The records specified in a) and b) shall include:
 - (1) The license or certificate holder's name;
 - (2) License or certificate number;
 - (3) The title and location of the instruction;
 - (4) Name of instructor or sponsoring organization, hours credited; and
 - (5) The identification code number assigned by the director ~~or regional accreditation committee~~ to the course program; and
 - (6) Date of course completion.
- (d) Certificates of course or program completion or written statements containing all the information specified in (c), issued by the instructor or sponsoring organization shall be sufficient to constitute the records specified in (a) and (b).
- (e) In addition to the records required to be maintained in a), the instructor or sponsoring organization shall submit, at a minimum, the information required in (c) (2), (5), and (6) to the Department within 14 days after the completion of the full course or program for each licensee and certificate holder. The information shall be submitted over the Internet using the Department's online Web site (www.cdpr.ca.gov) or via an electronic data file transfer process.
- ~~(e)~~ (f) The records specified in a) and b) shall be submitted to the director upon written request

A workshop will be held on December 13, 2010 at the CalEPA building to discuss the recommended changes. The workshop is open to the public.

Next agenda – date and topics

Next meeting date: Wednesday, February 24, 2010

Possible topics may include:

- a) Kettleman City – final report results
- b) Renewal update
- c) Committee updates - UC IPM

November 16, 2010

Public comment on any agenda item is welcome. Questions about this agenda should be directed to David Duncan at (916) 445-3870 or dduncan@cdpr.ca.gov.